

light reflected by a respective pixel at a different surface reflectance characteristic including using at least one procedural calculation to determine a first specular light intensity function, and obtaining a value of another specular light intensity function from a lookup table;

AB
determining a specularity modulation value for a respective pixel;

interpolating the specular light intensity functions using the specularity modulation value to obtain a composite specularity value; and

using said composite specularity value to modulate pixel color on said screen.

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 10, 17, 21-22, 31, 38, 49, 56, 60-61 and 77 would be allowable if rewritten in an independent form. The Examiner rejected the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kazama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,220) in view of Knittel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,342,885) and Wells et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,253,339). In response, Applicant has amended the independent claims to generally include the limitations of claim 10 which should thereby render these claims allowable. Applicant rewrote claim 17 as new independent claim 82 and will pursue additional combinations of allowed claims and new claims in a continuation application.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Please feel free to contact the undersigned should any remaining questions need to be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,



WILLIAM F. PRENDERGAST

Registration No. 34,699

Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200